

For much of this year, I have supported widespread ownership of the media so that we as Americans can have access to news and journalism, rather than what a corporation believes. When Russia was communistic, their news was biased and designed to support that government. If our government leaders in the white house make it easy to consolidate ownership and that corporation supports the leader with their money, they amount to paid political support.

Sinclair Broadcasting is a prime example with their plans to heir a critical piece on Kerry just a month before elections in violation of pure journalism and forcing their subsidiaries to pre-empt regular programming. Why not make it know that these are their opinions rather than objective journalism. People today are busy and to have a democracy, it's citizens need to be informed so they can make wise decisions. They should be confident that their news is true news rather than a partisan soap box.

Sinclair uses the public airwaves free of charge, and is obligated by law to serve the public interest. But when large companies control the airwaves, we get more of what's good for the bottom line and less of what we need for our democracy. Instead of something produced at "News Central" far away, it's more important that we see real people from our own communities and more substantive news about issues that matter.

Sinclair's actions show why we need to strengthen media ownership rules, not weaken them. They show why the license renewal process needs to involve more than a returned postcard. Thank you.